DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 309 IR 005 821

AUTHOR Dyson, Allan J.
TITLE Organizing Undergraduate Library Instruction: The English and American Experience.
SPONS AGENCY Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 8 Aug 74
NOTE 29p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Libraries; Librarians; *Library Instruction; Library Programs; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS England; United States

ABSTRACT

This report presents information on the administrative organization of library instruction programs for university undergraduates in the United States and England. Particular attention was paid to libraries with professionals designated as "library instruction librarians." Four patterns of organization were found; broad staff involvement with the library instruction librarian as coordinator proved the most effective. Commitment to library instruction on the part of the library administration was found to be an important factor. A sample job description for the position "library instruction coordinator" which was developed as a result of the study is appended. (Author/AWP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152309

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ORGANIZING UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY INSTRUCTION: THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Allan J. Dyson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A Council on Library Resources Fellowship Report

Allan J. Dyson
CLR Fellow, 1973-74
Head, Moffitt Undergraduate Library
University of California, Berkeley

August 8, 1974

IR005821

I am deeply grateful to the Council on Library Resources for giving me the opportunity to make this study. I am indebted to two librarians at Eastern Michigan University--Mary Butterfield, Library Orientation Exchange coordinator, and Hannelore Rader, library instruction librarian--who did considerable work in providing me with data and ideas upon which to base my questionnaire. A special debt is also owed to John Griffiths, Assistant Secretary of the Library Association in London, whose suggestions and introductions helped make the trip to England especially rewarding. And finally a "thank you" to the librarians who took the time to meet with me or to fill out my questionnaire. During my trips I frequently found myself acting as an "information broker"--relaying ideas about library instruction I had received at other schools. I hope the librarians I visited found this exchange as valuable as I did. Perhaps, at least in part, it repaid them for their time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction.....1

Methodology.....3

Undergraduate education and libraries in England.....6

Patterns of organization.....9

Evaluation and conclusions.....13

Appendixes:

1. Sample job description—library instruction coordinator
2. Questionnaire on library instruction for undergraduates
3. Schools visited

"Undergraduates are confused by the library, and require considerable help in finding their way around in it; they are unfamiliar with card catalogs and require assistance with the simplest lookups; they have difficulty finding materials in the stacks; they know little about bibliographic resources. In other words, they are unfamiliar with the rudimentary mechanics of library use. . . ."

--From a recent, major study of reference services at one of the most prestigious private universities in the U.S.

INTRODUCTION

Students don't know how to use libraries. Most can't efficiently handle the simplest bibliographic tasks they need to accomplish as students.

So long as university librarians viewed their primary mission as that of acquirers and organizers of knowledge, such student ignorance was a sad but largely unchanging fact. Now, however, librarians are taking a more aggressive view of their campus role. Throughout the country, librarians are committing staff time to library instruction. Programs at some small institutions have been widely acclaimed as successful (the ones at Wabash and Earlham Colleges perhaps the best known), but the question remains as to how best to organize programs at institutions with 5,000, 15,000 or even more undergraduates.

As a Council on Library Resources Fellow during 1973-1974, I studied the administrative organization of library instruction programs for undergraduates in the U.S. and England, emphasizing libraries with professionals designated as "library instruction librarians" (by whatever title). Simply stated, I attempted to determine whether libraries with such professionals seemed to have more effective programs than those without. As might be expected, the answers proved to be not so simple: the mere existence of such a position was no guarantee of success.

It should be stressed that this was an attempt to discover whether there were common adminstrative patterns to successful programs, not to evaluate individual techniques. Obviously, however, one must attempt early on to define "successful," no easy thing in an area that has not as yet developed any standards for determining the effectiveness of a given approach. Therefore, some rough quantitative guides were used to measure a given program, as will be discussed under "Methodology" below.

Some working definitions were needed to provide a framework for the study. A "library instruction librarian," orginally conceived of as a librarian who worked full-time on such programs, was quickly redefined to mean any professional who worked half-time or more on library instruction. It became apparent that many librarians combined an instruction specialty with other duties such as reference work, and indeed felt that this was vital if they were to function effectively as a library instruction librarian. The phrase "library instruction" was used primarily to mean programs that taught students how to use library resources, and excluded guided tours whose purpose was to orient students to a building, as well as welcoming lectures which simply introduced librarians (or the head librarian) to new students. The minimum size of enrollment, 8,000 for the schools visited in the U.S., was halved for England, since institutions of higher education are smaller there.

METHODOLOGY

The study had three major parts. First, I made two trips within the U.S., one to the East and one to the Midwest. The emphasis was on visiting many different types of programs, especially those that were widely written about or which were in the developmental stages--the latter on the theory that at those institutions the librarians would be doing considerable thinking about the best approaches to library instruction. In total, I visited ten U.S. libraries, ranging in size and type from Southern Illinois (Edwardsville) to SUNY-Buffalo to Brown.

Secondly, I spent five weeks in England, visiting about a dozen institutions (some more than once) and interviewing some 30 to 35 librarians involved in instructional programs. Again, a cross-section of libraries with instructional programs was visited, but in addition, several librarians who had previously organized or taught in programs were interviewed at their new positions--including Mr. Donovan Richnell, the new head of the British Library Reference Division (the British Museum Library) who had begun the tutor librarian program at the University of Reading. These librarians were able to give a particularly valuable (and perhaps more objective) view of British instructional programs.

The third portion of the study was a questionnaire (see Appendix 2) mailed to 48 U.S. and Canadian libraries which I believed had active instructional

programs and which had enrollments of approximately 8,000 students or more. Most of the libraries were members of Project LOEX, the Library Orientation Exchange at Eastern Michigan University. No questionnaires were mailed to libraries I had visited or intended to visit, and thus the results would in effect provide an independent verification--or rejection--of the conclusions I was drawing from the visits. In all, forty-two replies (over 87%) were received, of which thirty-eight were usable. Not everyone replied to every question.

The questionnaires were mailed to the director of libraries at each institution. At libraries having a library instruction librarian as defined, the director was asked to have that person reply. If the library did not have such a staff member, the director was to have the questionnaire answered by the person considered to be administratively responsible for such undergraduate instructional programs. Twelve of the thirty-eight usable replies were from library instruction librarians. Of these twelve, seven in the U.S. and two in Canada spent much of their time coordinating large programs involving many librarians other than themselves; the other three spent almost all their time giving rather than coordinating such instruction.

As was mentioned above, this study did not attempt to evaluate the techniques of library instruction (indeed there is considerable disagreement among those involved in such programs as to the value of one approach over another). However, some guides were needed so that I could evaluate the extent of commitment a given library had to its program. These guides, in the questionnaire, were as follows:

1. The number of individual classes to which library instruction sessions were presented in fall term 1973;

2. Whether there was a credit course in library use and to how many students it was given;

3. The extent of use of audio-visual equipment and self-guided instructional materials; and

4. How wide-ranging the involvement of library staff was in library instruction programs, or if the instruction was handled by one or more library instruction librarians, the size of staff in such a library instruction office.

Obviously, not all these elements needed to be present for a successful program, but some combination of them almost always was.

The programs that were visited could be evaluated more directly. At most institutions in both the U.S. and England, I interviewed not only those involved in library instruction, but also those whose administrative decisions and priorities determined the size and success of library instruction programs (usually the associate director for public service or the director or both).

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AND LIBRARIES IN ENGLAND

The visits to English libraries proved to be a fascinating experience—one that contributed a lot to my perspective on instructional programs. A very brief overview of English higher education and libraries might help the reader to understand the statistics and descriptions that follow.

There are four types of large undergraduate academic institutions in England. Oxford/Cambridge are in a class by themselves; the student has a close working relationship with a single tutor, and the librarian has little role as a teacher. The "red-brick" universities, usually several decades old, are frequently prestigious and have libraries that tend to follow the "Oxbridge" emphasis on book collection over service, but with some exceptions. The new "plate-glass" universities built in the sixties combine innovative academic programs and a comparatively small bookstock, a combination which requires imagination in teaching students how to exploit the available resources. Finally, the polytechnics, upgraded to university status during the sixties, face many of the same library use problems as the plate-glass universities. A simplistic but perhaps useful comparison of relative status would be as follows: the polytechnics and plate-glass universities are similar to our state colleges (such as the California and New York systems); the red-bricks equate to our land grant universities; and Oxbridge, of course, to our Ivy League and other prestigious private universities. Within English academic

libraries, the plate-glass universities and the polytechnics have the most wide-spread committment to library instruction, with several of the red-bricks also having innovative programs.

Several ways in which English academic libraries differ from most of their American counterparts result in an increased need for user instruction. First, they generally do not have a reference staff or a central reference point as such (although there frequently is an information desk for directional and other brief questions); instead, they tend to rely much more heavily on subject librarians to whom patrons with bibliographic questions are directed. Secondly, they do not have what we would call a subject catalog; their "subject catalog" would be to us a public shelf list, by classification number. Also, there are four major classification schemes found in different libraries (Bliss, UDC, Dewey and LC), making it even more likely than in the States that a new student will be unfamiliar with a given scheme. (It's a bit of a shock to an American libarian to walk into an academic library that is in the midst of converting to Dewey!)

These factors have created a high level of conciousness on the part of British librarians regarding the need for library instruction programs. Fulfilling this need has been assisted by formal courses in the literature of a field given for librarians by the National Lending Library at Boston Spa. Such courses, originally in science and technology, have recently branched into the social sciences and humanities. Considerable attention is also being given to audio-visual aids—particulary tape/slide guides to individual bibliographic tools and library resources—by the Standing Conference on National and University Libraries (SCONUL), the group roughly equivalent to the Association of Research Libraries here. SCONUL has been coordinating the production of such

guides nation-wide so that there is no duplication of effort. In addition, the government's Office for Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI), in conjunction with SCONUL, is undertaking a major study to evaluate the effectiveness of tape/slide programs and other instructional aids.

All of this activity has accelerated the interest in instructional programs. Carey's 1966 study of library instruction techniques in Britain indicated that only 21% of the university and polytechnic libraries were giving basic bibliographic instruction.[1] When surveyed seven years later by Fjallbrant, the figure had risen to 60%.[2]

In sum, I came away with the feeling that the commitment to library instruction programs was more wide-spread in England than in the U.S., both at the national level and by individual librarians. University libraries in the U.S. have been more innovative in using audio-visual hardware, programmed-learning workbooks, and the like, but since there has been little coordination nationally, the results have had less impact than the comparatively fewer but better coordinated (and evaluated) programs in England.

---

[1] R.J.P. Carey, "Library Instruction in Colleges and Universities in Britain," Library Association Record, 70 (March, 1968), pp. 66-70.

[2] Nancy Fjallbrant, "Library Instruction for Students in Universities in Britain," Transactions of Chalmers University of Technology, (Gothenberg, Sweden), no. 335 (1974).

PATTERNS OF ORGANIZATION

Everyone seems to agree that library instruction is needed—and now that motherhood and the flag are being de-sanctified, it is one of the few Good Things still around. Beyond that, however, agreement dissolves. Who should give it, who should be in charge of it, how it should be given, and what priority it should have are questions that have been debated by the profession for decades.[3] Nevertheless, this study did confirm the rapid expansion of instructional programs; of the twelve library instruction librarian positions evaluated through the questionnaire, for example, nine had been created within the last three years; likewise ten of the fourteen credit courses in library use were begun in 1971 or later. However it is organized, library instruction is getting a higher priority than it used to, and librarians are putting money and staff time into it even though the past few years have been ones of lean budgets.

The way in which a library organizes its library instruction program usually falls into one of four basic patterns. These patterns held true both in the U.S. and in England, and seemed to be confirmed by the results of the

---

[3] An excellent summary of the history of library instruction, along with an up-to-date and international bibliography, is Johnnie Givens' "The Use of Resources in the Learning Experience," in Melvin J. Voigt, ed., Advances in Librarianship, v. 4 (New York: Academic Press, 1974), pp. 149-174.

questionnaire. These are by no means the only patterns, but the few libraries falling outside them almost always have some unusual element that make their program unique—for example, an undergraduate library-science department that handles most library instruction. Also, the variations within the patterns are considerable, with evident success at one library and less at another.

Pattern A: The "underground" library instruction librarian. This pattern is found where there is little concrete support on the part of the library administration for instructional programs, but at least some of the public service staff feel it vital to their library's operation. The library instruction librarian has a titular position such as reference librarian, but is informally spending 50% or more of his or her time involved in instruction through the connivance of fellow staffers and the benevolence of the head of the unit. As might be expected, some of the librarians involved resent the need to handle instruction in this way, feeling that the administration wants the publicity of such a program, without the committment to free staff time to do it.

Pattern B: Designated library instruction librarian with little staff involvement. In this situation, the library administration has funded one or more library instruction positions, and these librarians handle almost all the instruction. The size and success of the program varies widely from place to place, dependent almost entirely on the size of the staffing of the instructional office. On one end of the scale is a beleagured librarian who, after reporting in a questionnaire that she carries most of the teaching load, added, "A coordinator is definitely essential—one person cannot carry the teaching load." At the other end is an instructional office of four FTE—librarians and support staff. Successful programs under this pattern tend to have two or more people instructing, sometimes with supporting staff to handle paperwork. It is under

this pattern that one frequently finds a librarian working 100% of the time on library instruction, with no additional responsibilities. In England such librarians sometimes have a different status on the campus from other librarians, being paid under the faculty scale rather than under the library scale—although, in fairness, the difference between the two scales is not as great as at some American institutions.

Pattern C: Broad staff involvement, no library instruction librarian. In these libraries, the responsibility for administering the program lies with a unit head, usually the head of a reference department or undergraduate library; or, where there is no central reference department, with the head of public service. The actual instruction is almost always handled by reference librarians or subject specialists. Comments written on the questionnaire indicate that often a junior librarian (usually in reference) is assigned responsibility for a particular program—a given year's freshman orientation lectures or an audio-visual project, for example—which would take only 5% to 25% of his or her time. Usually instructional programs at these schools are medium-sized, reaching 10 to 40 classes with bibliographic lectures per term. In a few libraries, where the administration is strongly committed to library instruction, there are extensive programs. For example, one Eastern university gives about 100 bibliographic lectures, has a one-credit course in library use, and uses video tape for point-of-use instruction within the library; another is organizing a "cradle-to-grave" instruction program involving staff at all levels. In one English university, each of the ten or so subject specialists takes part in a three-level instruction program for all students.

Pattern D: Broad staff involvement with library instruction librarians as coordinators. Unlike pattern B, the library instruction librarian at these

institutions does not do most of the instruction; it is usually given by reference librarians, subject specialists, and occasionally others. The coordinator, however, is responsible for the administration of much of the program, including scheduling, record keeping, and the like, and is usually expected to keep in touch with new developments in the instructional field including the possible application of audio-visual techniques. The coordinator also is the contact person for faculty interested in the program, and in fact is often expected to be active in selling the program both to faculty and to other librarians. All coordinators spend at least some time teaching in the instructional program, and sometimes take responsibility for one portion of the program—for example, handling all the lower division introductory lectures or giving all the instruction in a particular subject. Most frequently, the coordinators spend only 50% to 75% of their time on instructional activities. Usually they work at a reference desk, but other split assignments are also found—for example, a coordinator at an English polytechnic is also responsible for staff training, and one on the West Coast heads a circulation/interlibrary loan department half-time. Almost all report either to the head of reference of to the head of public service, except in a few cases where a split assignment results in their reporting directly to the head librarian.

EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Each of these patterns develops as a result of local conditions, and it is impossible to say that all libraries should organize their instruction in one particular way. A staff committed to the concept of library instruction may have little choice but to go the underground route if they are faced with an administration that pays only lip service to the idea. The reverse may also be true; a new administrator may find herself faced with a staff of the "I-came-into-librarianship-so-I-wouldn't-have-to-teach" school, and may only be able to start an instructional program by hiring someone to teach full time. A reference or public services head strongly believing in the need for an instructional program but unable to create a coordinator position may feel it is important enough to handle the coordination himself. Another, equally committed, may feel that she is too busy to do a good job at it and be willing to lower some other priority in order to create a coordinator position. Nevertheless, it <u>is</u> possible to say what the advantages and disadvantages of each pattern of organization seem to be, and quantitatively at least, which results in the "best" programs.

Pattern A (the "underground" instructional librarian) is not in fact a program, but rather the result of an absence of program. I believe that even the librarians at schools where this pattern exists would prefer another approach.

Pattern B (library instruction librarians doing most or all of the teaching) has many points in its favor. Where the administration has given sufficient support to the program, the library instruction librarians tend to be strongly in favor of this approach. It enables them to be real specialists in instructional techniques, and indeed the administration can place a greater importance on classroom ability in hiring for the position than they might if the position required a variety of skills. The librarians become well-known to and accepted by the faculty, and therefore gain easier access to the classroom. And it ensures that someone will be available to do the instructing who isn't expected to carry a full-time load doing something else.

There are several very real disadvantages to this approach, however. Most obviously, it does not take advantage of the special subject skills that other librarians may have. While the questionnaire answers from these schools are too few and diverse for much analysis, my impression from them and from my visits to other such schools is that most instruction is going on at the beginning-student level. Another problem is that this pattern sets library instruction apart from the "normal" activities of the library, and the librarian that gives it apart from other reference or subject librarians. To imply that library instruction is something different from rather than an extension of regular reference work upsets some librarians. Many would agree with the questionnaire comment of a reference librarian from New England, "If a person does not like library instruction, he's not a reference librarian!"

Several comments from libraries without library instruction librarians seemed to indicate that if having one meant that others were not to be involved in instruction, they didn't want such a position. A Midwestern librarian wrote, "We don't feel that one person full-time can have the expertise and time for

faculty contacts as our current system allows." (They now have ten librarians involved in giving bibliographic lectures in the area of their respective subject specialties.) Where the library instruction librarian was conceived of as a coordinator, however, librarians in programs without such a position viewed the concept much more favorably.

Pattern C (broad staff involvement with no library instruction librarian) and pattern D (library instruction coordinator) have equally strong adherants. On the one hand is the argument that if library instruction is as important as many of us think it is, then it should be handled through the administrative hierarchy, with someone like the head of reference or public services organizing the program. On the other hand is the somewhat more pragmatic argument that administrators have many pressures on them, and the coordination of library instruction may get shunted aside if there isn't someone whose job it is to see that it gets done. "Nobody's beating down my door to demand library instruction," the harried head of an undergraduate library commented, and the associate director at a school in the Northwest wrote, "As it is in real life, such undertakings are just one of many, many tasks and therefore do not receive the TLC they would get from a professional devoting at least half-time to the project."

This problem was illustrated at an English plate-glass university, where the head of public services is nominally responsible for coordinating the program. In discussions with the librarians that provide the instruction in different subjects, it became obvious that they were not aware of what each other was doing—in fact, several were still struggling with a technical problem that another had solved a year before. More importantly, perhaps, was the sense that the program was lacking a sense of direction. Several

librarians were spending less and less time on instruction for undergraduates, and more time on graduates, because it was "easier to do," without ever having discussed whether this was in fact where they wanted the program to go.

Analyzing the questionnaire data leads one to the conclusion that having a library instruction coordinator—pattern D—is a more successful approach than any other. Libraries with coordinators had by far the most extensive instructional programs. Six of the seven U.S. libraries with such coordinators had credit courses in library use, compared with nine out of twenty-six libraries which had good programs but no coordinator. These courses were not at the expense of class-related bibliographic lectures, however, since the average number of classes reached in programs with coordinators was over 80, compared with under 35 at schools with no library instruction librarian. Pattern D libraries were also much more likely to have self-guided or programmed library instruction materials. Where library instruction librarians did all the instruction—pattern B—the number of bibliographic lectures varied widely, depending on the staffing of the instructional office. No pattern B schools had a credit course in library use, however, nor did any of the ones from this pattern that were visited in the U.S. and England.

Several questions resulted in interesting though inconclusive data. Although 80% of the libraries reported using audio-visual equipment as part of their instructional program, the use followed no particular pattern. Some libraries with extensive instructional programs did not use it at all, some used it in conjunction with their programs, and one seemed to be using it in place of any other instructional approach. Similarly, while the presence of an advisory committee on library instruction was much more likely at schools where there were library instruction librarians, the absence of such a com-

mittee did not seem to effect the scope of a program. Of course, one might guess that the commitment and input from other staff members leads to a better coordinated and more widely accepted program, and therefore an advisory committee would be desirable.

What are the implications of this study for library administrators and staff members organizing instructional programs? Several general conclusions can be drawn from the questionnaire replies and visits.

1. The most effective library instruction programs are those that involve a large number of library staff members—either pattern C or pattern D. Where one or more library instruction librarians do all the teaching, there is considerable chance of friction developing between the instructional office and other public service units. Since ultimately these units serve the more sophisticated patrons presumably generated by library instruction, this friction may well negate some of the effectiveness of the instructional program.

2. Between patterns C and D, more extensive programs are present at the latter, where an instructional specialist coordinates the program. Coordination tends to get shunted aside when handled by an administrator under pressure from other duties.

3. The overriding factor determining the success of an instructional program is the extent of commitment to it by the library administration. The commitment can be shown in many ways—for example, hours for instruction can be built into each public service librarian's schedule, and participation can be a factor in the evaluation criteria for promotion. The symbolic act of creating an instructional coordinator position can itself be most important; this is perhaps best summed up by the comments of one such librarian:

> The emphasis placed on instructional services by the library administration in creating this new position has prompted considerable activity on the part of many librarians to participate in or develop instructional programs. . . . Considerable interest is being shown by present staff, and new staff are hired with the understanding that they will participate.

4. Finally, it can be said unequivocally that library instruction is needed by <u>all</u> undergraduates in <u>all</u> types of schools. Such arguments as "Our students are too bright to need it" or "Our faculty would never let us into the classroom" are simply bad excuses for inaction. They are refuted by hundreds of librarians, here and abroad, in schools ranging from the most prestigious Ivy League universities to the newest public institutions, who are organizing enthusiastically received programs.

A basic objective of academic librarianship <u>must</u> be that every student, by the time he or she completes an undergraduate education, should be able to make effective use of library resources. I strongly believe that to strive for less is to deny our professional responsibilities.

SAMPLE JOB DESCRIPTION—LIBRARY INSTRUCTION COORDINATOR

This job description combines elements of the duties of several library instruction coordinators at U.S. and Canadian universities.* It is suggested as a guide to those libraries setting up such a position.

The Library Instruction Coordinator, under the general direction of the Assistant Director for Public Services, is responsible for the initiation, development, and evaluation of a coordinated program of library instruction. He/she is responsible for keeping abreast of the latest developments in library instruction including audio-visual innovations and for making recommendations to improve the library's orientation and instructional programs.

1. The coordinator is primarily responsible for providing orientation and instruction to lower division undergraduates. Typical activities include:

   a. Participating in campus-wide orientation programs for new students;

   b. Preparing library guides, self-guided tours, and other aids to general library orientation to the Main and branch libraries;

   c. Acting as an advocate of bibliographic instruction, and working with faculty to integrate such instruction into classes; and

   d. Acting as course coordinator for and teaching a section of the non-specialized credit course in bibliographic research.

2. The coordinator assists with upper-division and graduate-level instruction through:

   a. Acting as a contact person for faculty and putting them in touch with the appropriate librarian;

   b. Serving as a resource person to the reference and subject librarians providing such instruction;

---

*My thanks to the librarians at the following schools who sent me their job descriptions: Sir George Williams University; California State University, Los Angeles; University of New Mexico; University of Missouri, St. Louis; and New York City Community College.

c. Assisting with the selection and preparation of classroom materials (including teaching aids) for such instruction; and

d. Serving as a back-up instructor.

3. The coordinator regularly works some hours at major service points in the system, including the Main and Undergraduate Library reference desks.

4. The coordinator has the following administrative responsibilities:

a. Collect and organize statistics on library instruction in the library system;

b. Prepare an annual report on orientation/instructional activities within the system;

c. Train and supervise staff assigned to the instructional office;

d. Sit ex officio on the Library Instruction Advisory Committee; and

e. Participate in other library and university committee work as appropriate.

* * * * * * * * *

Countless variations on this description are possible. Several common ones actually in practice at some schools are as follows:

1. The coordinator reports to the head of reference, rather than the head of public services—this might be most appropriate in a relatively small system with few branches;

2. In a large system, the coordinator might report to the head of an undergraduate library, and be responsible for undergraduate instruction only;

3. Many librarians rather than just the coordinator might participate in the lower-division program; or conversely, the coordinator might have a subject expertise and give upper-division bibliographic lectures in that field;

4. The coordinator might combine the instruction specialty with some other responsibility, such as book selection, library publications, or staff training.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON LIBRARY INSTRUCTION FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Name of institution _____ Approx. undergrad. enrollment _____

Name of person answering questionnaire _____ Position _____

NOTE: This study is of library instruction for undergraduates only. The phrase "library instruction" is used primarily to mean bibliographic instruction programs, as opposed to orientation tours and the like. A "library instruction librarian" is defined as someone who spends half-time or more coordinating and/or giving such instruction.

I. PROGRAMS

1. Does your program include bibliographic lectures to classes?_____ If yes, in the library or in the classroom?_____ Approximate number of classes reached in fall session 1973:_____

2. Do you have a credit course in library use?_____ If yes: year started____ Number of credit hours_____ If taught in sections, number of sections taught per semester or quarter_____ Average size of section_____ Number of students that take course per year (approx.)_____

3. Do you have any self-guided or programmed library instruction materials?_____ Are they for credit?_____ What level student are they aimed at?_____ _____ Who organizes, distributes, and corrects these materials? _____

4. Do you use AV equipment in orienting students to the library or reference tools?_____ Please briefly list the programs in which such equipment is used (e. g., "self-guided cassette tour of library," "point-of-use videotape on LC list of subject headings," etc.):

II. ORGANIZATION OF PROGRAMS

1. What is the position of staff members who do bibliographic instruction for undergraduates (e.g., reference librarians, library instruction librarian only)?

2. Is there one person who organizes such programs?_____ If yes, what is his/her position_____ What percentage of their time is spent on library instruction?_____ To whom does he/she report?_____ _____ Is this person responsible for organizing all library instruction for undergraduates?_____ Is there an advisory committee working with this person?_____ How are its members chosen?_____

Appendix 2

III. ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

1. Who is administratively responsible for library instruction programs for undergraduates (e.g., head of reference, head of undergraduate library, associate director for public services, etc.)?_____

2. How is this responsibility exercised (e.g., library instruction librarian reports to them, they head advisory committee, etc.)?_____

IV. CONCEPT OF THE LIBRARY INSTRUCTION LIBRARIAN

A. To be answered by those institutions with no library instruction librarian as such. Library instruction librarians should answer the questions on page 3.

1. Do you feel your program would be better if you had a library instruction librarian as defined above? Please comment.

2. Do you have plans for creating such a position?_____ If yes, approximate date by which you feel you will have one:_____

3. Do you feel that having such a librarian might narrow the scope of your programs by putting all responsibility on one person? Please comment.

4. If you hired such a person, do you feel that this would primarily be a coordinator of programs, or would they handle the bulk of the instruction personally?

IV. (cont.)
B. To be answered by library instruction librarians only.

1. What is your official title?_____
How long has your institution had such a position?_____ Is there a separate library instruction office with its own staffing?_____ If yes, total professional and non-professional FTE of this office:_____

2. Do you view your position primarily as one of coordinator or as the person who should do most of the instruction? Please comment.

3. Do you have other (non-instructional) responsibilities?_____ If yes, roughly what percentage of your time overall is spent on them (e.g., "spend 20% of time as reference librarian")?_____

4. Has the existence of your position tended to act as a catalyst for other instruction programs in your library, or has it tended to concentrate all responsibility on you? Please comment.

5. How is your position funded (e.g., grant money, regular staff position, special funds from campus administration)?

6. What in your view is the future of your program (e.g., will end when grant ends, is expanding with new position to be added, etc.)? Please comment.

7. If you have a written job description, I would very much appreciate your including a copy with your reply.

Thank you for your help. If you have additional comments, criticisms of the questionnaire, or questions, please add them on the back of this sheet. Return the questionnaire to:

Allan J. Dyson, Head
Moffitt Undergraduate Library
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

SCHOOLS VISITED

Eastern Trip:

Brown University, Providence, R.I.
Columbia University, New York, N.Y.
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.
Harvard University (Undergraduate Library), Cambridge, Ma.
University of Maryland (Undergraduate Library), College Park, Md.
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.
SUNY-Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.

Midwestern Trip:

Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Mi.
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mi.
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Il.

England:

University of Bradford
British Library Lending Division, Boston Spa
British Library Reference Division, London
Hatfield Polytechnic
University of Lancaster
Leicester Polytechnic
University of London (Institute of Education)
North London Polytechnic
University of Southampton
University of Surrey, Guildford

Plus interviews with:
Dr. Hazel Mews, former tutor librarian at the University of Reading
Mr. Frank Hatt, former librarian at the Canterbury College of Art
Mr. Christopher Hunt, former social sciences librarian at Manchester University